REMARKS

This is in response to the Office communication mailed January 2, 2002, providing one month to clarify Applicants' response to certain issues raised in the Office Action mailed August 8, 2001. The present Amendment is intended to supplement the Amendment filed October 16, 2001 and addresses the issues raised in the communication mailed January 2, 2002.

In response to the Examiner's comment that applicants have failed to address the lack of basis for the tinII percent content of claim 2, the claim has been further amended to indicate that the tinII content is less than 0.4% by weight based on the weight of the composition. Support for this amendment may be found in the disclosure on page 22, lines 13-14.

Regarding the issue raised in paragraph (5) of the Office Action mailed August 8, 2001, applicants have previously noted that the citation of DE 33 32 463 on the PTO-1449 form attached to the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 20, 2000 was incorrect. A review of this document, a copy of which was submitted on December 20, 2000, will show that it is directed to subject matter unrelated to the presently claimed invention. The initialed 1449 form attached to the Office Action mailed August 8, 2001 has this DE document crossed out.

On January 16, 2001, an Information Disclosure Statement was filed which included a PTO-1449 form with the correct number of the intended DE document, i.e., 32 32 463, along with a copy of the document and an English language abstract. In the initialed copy of the 1449 form attached to the Office Action mailed August 8, 2001, the Examiner

deleted the words "w/English Abstract." This indicated to Applicants that the Examiner had considered the correct document but not the English Abstract. Accordingly, a copy of the document, i.e., DE 32 32 463, along with the Abstract, was attached to the Response filed October 16, 2001. Applicants do not want the Examiner to consider DE 33 32 463 and he has not done so as indicated by the deleted entry on one of the 1449 forms attached to the Office Action mailed August 8, 2001. Applicants request that the Examiner acknowledge that he has reviewed the English Abstract of DE 32 32 463.

With respect to the issue raised in the second paragraph of the Office communication mailed January 2, 2002, claims 15 and 41 have been amended in an attempt to comply with the Examiner's request for clarification. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, on page 7, lines 15-23 of the disclosure.

If any issues remain which the Examiner would like to discuss, he is requested to contact the undersigned at (703) 838-6683.

Respectfully submitted,

Burns, Doane, Swecker & Mathis, L.L.P.

Rv.

George F. Lesmes

Registration No. 19,995

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404 (703) 836-6620

Date: January 16, 2002

Application No. <u>09/497,176</u> Attorney's Docket No. <u>022701-863</u>

Page 1



Attachment to Supplemental Amendment dated January 16, 2002 Marked-up Claims 2, 15 and 41

- 2. (Twice Amended) The composition according to claim 1, having a content of tinII salts lower than 0.4% by weight based on the weight of the composition, and having a carboxylic acid function with the proviso that, when carboxylic acid in a free form or in the form of a salt has an acid number greater than 30, the amine content is less than 0.6% (equivalent) of the total isocyanate function (masked and free).
- 15. (Amended) The composition according to claim 1, further comprising one or more additional isocyanates at least partially masked by the one or more masking agents, wherein at least one of the isocyanates contains polymethylene chains (CH₂) π and said chains represent one third or more of the masked isocyanates.
- 41. (Amended) The composition according to claim 25, further comprising one or more additional isocyanates at least partially masked by the one or more masking agents, wherein at least one of the isocyanates contains polymethylene chains (CH₂) π and said chains represent one third or more of the masked isocyanates.

